



## **Cemetery Commission Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date:** Thursday, February 21, 2018, 4:30 pm

**Commissioners Present:** Rita Church, Lainey Rappaport, Francis (Tag) Taginski

**Staff Present:** Holli Bushnell - Office Assistant, Deryk Roach – BPRW Director

**Community Members Present:** Ron Wannamaker, Kienan Christianson

Mtg. was called to order at 4:32pm by Taginski

### **I. Approval of Agenda**

Francis Taginski asked that the vacant seat on the commission and the appointment of the new commissioner (Jennifer Diaz) be added to the agenda. Lainey Rappaport requested that the Perpetual Care Fund be added to the agenda under commissioner items. Rita Church moved to approve the amended agenda, Rappaport seconded.

### **II. Approval of Minutes from September 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Rappaport moved, Church seconded.

Before old business was addressed, Rappaport welcomed Kienan Christianson, a candidate for city council, to the meeting.

The commission members briefly discussed concerns over the lack of attendance on the part of Mellisa Cain. They noted that, since beginning her appointment in July she has attended less than one full meeting. They asked that Holli Bushnell speak with Lori Olberg (the person at the clerk's office who handles the city council and commission and board appointments) regarding Cain's lack of attendance/commitment. The general consensus between all commissioners was that Cain should step down so the seat could be filled by someone who can regularly attend meetings.

### **III. Old Business**

#### **A. Section 6 Update**

\$15,000 is required for the Section 6 survey. Deryk Roach reports that this item has been requested for the FY20 budget. The preparation of section 6 is the lynchpin of future cemetery development (example: any progress on green burials is halted until section 6 is completed). Planning and Zoning as well as Cindi Wight both feel that the city does not have the space for a new cemetery, especially in light of the fact that section 6 would provide the city with approximately 10 more years of burials. The good news is that this extends the time for the city to find a new cemetery, but it also makes finding the space for a new cemetery a lower priority for the city.

Taginski has asked if it would be possible to look for grant money or matching funds for the development of section 6. This may be important in light of the fact that the cemetery is a



lower priority than other city areas with higher “metrics.” BPRW can provide grant writing assistance. Taginski hopes to be involved with the RFP process for section 6.

Roach asked if other areas near section 6 have been identified as area for future burials. Jeff Shedd will identify those areas.

A large part of the section 6 plan includes one or more cremation gardens. There is a good amount of capital involved in the creation of these spaces (this may be where grant money would come into play), but, ultimately, the design process is quite exciting. The hope is that the new section will help address changing burial trends. Church asked if the cost of the new cremation garden(s) is on par with what was previously made at Lakeview. The cost is similar, but we won’t have all the details or exact numbers until the study is completed.

#### **B. Lakeview Fence Repair/Replacement**

Taginski reports that he walked the perimeter of the fence along with surveyor. The good news is that the fence can be replicated, but, unfortunately, 95% of the current fence is unrepairable. Additionally, the fence in its current form is extremely difficult to care for. The results of the survey indicate that a fence similar to the one at Elmwood would probably be best. While the commission initially wanted to use an iron fence, the cost of that may be prohibitive. An anodized aluminum or steel fence is more practical from a budget standpoint. For safety and installation purposes, the new fence will need to move further into the cemetery and will require the removal and replanting of the trees that currently border the area. Station poles will also be added, though they were not part of the original fence design.

Taginski stated that he would share the digital report he received with the other commissioners so they can also review the findings before the next meeting. In order to move forward, materials on the history of the fence, images, goals for the project, and information on any historical and workmanship requirements as well as the possibility for a manufacturing warranty need to be gathered.

Roach stated that in the upcoming bidding process the city will be asking for proposals using different materials. He is hoping there is some flexibility in terms of design (whether we will need to have the fence specially fabricated or if we would possibly use pre-made fence segments. Ron Wannamaker pointed out that, before bidding can take place the city will need to find out if the fence comes under any historical requirements such as Act 250 or Sec. 106. Roach also confirmed that solutions for drainage will need to be included in the bids.

Taginski stated that the curvature of the fence near the main gate is custom and we will be keeping those pieces, either in their current location or down in the cemetery as part of an exhibit on the original fence. The general consensus is that the city will need someone to research the historical information on the fence.

In addressing concerns about the bidding process, Roach confirmed that bidders work with the city, not against them. The bidders will have insight into finances which will allow them to plan better. While the dream would be to complete the entire project in one fell swoop, realistically it will need to be done in phases. Roach also confirmed that someone will speak with Eric Farrell in regards to his existing agreement with the city in regards to fencing, and his work on the drainage for the Cambrian Rise project will need to move in tandem to the fence work.

BPRW will identify possible materials for use to improve the quality of bids they receive. Bidding will hopefully be completed in March and construction will hopefully begin in the



summer. They are asking for creative solutions to the various issues concerning the fence, and they will ask for replacement gates and final production as an addendum to basic bids. Roach is hoping for approval by the next meeting so that he can get feedback from the commission. He is also hoping for public support through the permitting process.

**C. Lakeview office building repair update**

Martha Kennan is restructuring the project and putting it out for bid this spring.

**D. Grave GPS Project**

Taginski hopes that this might be a good project for the commission to seek grant money/external support on. As with all other city projects, we will need to compare and contrast at least 3 different software programs before deciding on the best option for our goals. Ultimately Taginski hopes that this project could be financially lucrative for the cemetery. It would also address City Councilor Tracy's interest in an online, searchable database for the cemetery.

**E. Planning/Zoning Letter Update**

P&Z informed Taginski that a new cemetery in the south end is not a viable option. As the space report from Jeff Shedd indicates that, with the addition of sections 6 and 8, there will be plenty of room at Lakeview for years to come, the need for a new cemetery is no longer pressing. The good news is that the city is now listing cemetery analysis as important in Plan BTW which will enable us to plan for the future with greater ease.

**F. Endowment Fund/Capital Campaign Discussion**

BPRW does not want the Commission to start a capital campaign, and thus it is not something the commission will pursue in the near future. In the future, the commission may identify a project and seek out funding specifically for that. Unfortunately, collaboration/coordination in funding efforts between the Friends of Lakeview and the commission is not plausible.

**IV. New Business**

**A. FY20 Budget**

The budget has not been finalized. Projects are currently being bid on. That said, the section 6 study is included in the current draft of the budget and there is hope that those funds may be approved.

**V. Superintendent and Office Assistant Report**

Holli Bushnell did not have any items to report.

**VI. Parks Director Items**

Roach did not have any items to report on behalf of Cindi Wight.

**VII. Commissioner Items**

**A. Signage**

Signage has been posted at all three city cemeteries! Rappaport reports that there has already been a change in behavior at Greenmount. The overall feedback is extremely positive, but she hopes that more signage can be placed in more obvious locations once the weather improves. At this time Rappaport also asked the commission to address the need for a trash can at Greenmount as well as road repairs there in the spring.



Church asked that, as the Friends of Lakeview will be holding their annual open chapel and civil war tour on May 25<sup>th</sup>, the cemetery close for burials on that day. The commission agreed that this was a wise course of action and voted to hold burials on the 25<sup>th</sup>. The question was raised as to whether Lakeview and Elmwood could receive historical designation/signage. Bushnell will investigate. Roach also suggested that Bushnell connect with Megan O'Daniel in regards to getting the Louisa Howard Chapel on the list of rental spaces contained in Civic Rec.

#### **VIII. Public Comments**

No public comments were made at this time.

#### **IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:22pm.

The next commission meeting is scheduled for 3/28 at 4:30pm and will be held at the Lakeview Office.